

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated May 28, 2008, is respectfully requested in view of this amendment. By this amendment, claims 33 and 36 have been amended. Claims 35, 37-40 and 43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 34, 41 and 42 remain unchanged. In this regard, Applicant notes that the amended claims merely clarify the subject matter recited in the rejected claims, but do not narrow the scope of the claims. Claims 33, 34, 36, 41, and 42 are pending in this application.

By this Response and Amendment, amended claim 33 is now a combination of the subject matter of previously presented claim 33 with the subject matter of dependent claims 35 and 37-40, now cancelled. The changes to claim 33 set forth the features of the backbone comprising at least one substantially continuous length of cable of three electrically insulated sets of electrically conducting cores, wherein three separately insulated sets of electrically conducting cores include at least three active, neutral or earth wires, a plurality of branched electrical outlets, where each branched outlet is electrically connected to a separate arrangement of active, neutral and earth wiring from the respective electrically conducting cores, such that an electrical socket connected to a first branched outlet, forms part of an electrically separated circuit back to the main supply to that of another electrical socket connected to a second branched outlet having a different active, neutral and earth wiring arrangement. These features are described, *inter alia* beginning in standard paragraph [0011] of the specification as previously amended.

Claim 36 has been amended solely to modify its claim dependency to claim 34 as claim 35 has been cancelled.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments introduce no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 35-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33, 35-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,486,407 to Hawker et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Hawker et al. ‘407 patent”).

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 34 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hawker et al. ‘407 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,149,277 to LeMaster (hereinafter referred to as “the LeMaster ‘277 patent”).

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 35-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

### **Response**

Claim 36 has been amended and, as amended, the rejections thereto are respectfully traversed. Claims 35 and 37-40 have been cancelled, and thus the rejections are moot.

Applicant notes that the Examiner did not specifically address claim 36 in the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection and that claim 36 did not contain the limitation “the or each cable”, which was the basis of the rejection by the Examiner and therefore assumes that claim 36 was included solely due to its dependency from claim 35. By this Amendment, claim 35 has been cancelled and thus claim 36 has been amended to depend from claim 34, which was not rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112. Neither claim 34 nor amended claim 36 contains the limitation “the or each cable”, which was the basis of the rejection by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 33, 35-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Hawker et al. ‘407 patent.

### Response

Applicant traverses the rejections as all of the features of the presently claimed subject matter are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited prior art of record.

For a reference to anticipate an invention, all of the elements of that invention must be present in the reference. The test for anticipation under section 102 is whether each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 987); MPEP §2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP §2131.

### Overview

The Hawker et al. '407 patent discloses an electricity distribution system such as a power strip that has adjustable outlets. The Hawker et al. '407 patent fails to show or suggest the feature of sockets possessing both physical *and electrical* separation, as claimed in at least the newly amended independent claim 33.

Amended independent claim 33 recites:

“A wiring assembly for a building comprising an electrical power supply backbone, a first end thereof being adapted to connect directly to an incoming mains power supply at a switch board of the building, wherein the backbone comprises at least one substantially continuous length of cable of three electrically insulated sets of electrically conducting cores, wherein three separately insulated sets of electrically conducting cores includes at least three active, neutral or earth wires, a plurality of branched electrical outlets, where each branched outlet is electrically connected to a separate arrangement of active, neutral and earth wiring from the respective electrically conducting cores, such that an electrical socket connected to a first branched outlet, forms part of an electrically separated circuit back to the main supply to that of another

electrical socket connected to a second branched outlet.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims provide for a cable which forms part of an electrical power supply backbone for the wiring assembly. What makes this particular cable unique over the prior art of record is that this cable includes at least three separately insulated cores. The meaning of separately insulated cores is best understood with reference to Figure 3 where one can see that the cable in effect has separate sections made up of three active wires, three negative or neutral wires and three earth wires.

By branching the female outlets directly from the main cable, one of ordinary skill in the art can appreciate that each of the separate outlets will take, for example, one of the positive, one of the negative and one of the earth wires. This particular outlet will then be electrically and physically isolated from an outlet which has been branched from a different active, neutral and earth wire.

Hence, the female outlets that have been branched from the main cable will only have electrical association with another branched outlet on the basis that this other branched outlet derived its electrical connection from the main cable with the same selection of positive, neutral and earth wiring.

#### Rejection of claims (21,) 33 and 35-42

The rejection of claim 21 in the body of Examiner’s “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102” is moot as claim 21 was cancelled in Applicant’s Response and Amendment filed February 4, 2008.

The rejection of claims 35 and 37-40 are moot as by this Response and Amendment, these claims are presently cancelled as discussed above.

Again, as a person of ordinary skill in the art can appreciate, as defined by the amended claims, a cable that includes at least three active, three neutral and three earth wiring can be used to establish three independent electric isolated circuits.

The prior art of record cannot achieve this and Applicant particularly notes that each of

the female outlets labeled as element 67 in Figure 2 of the Hawker et al. '407 patent outlets may be physically separated, but are *not electrically isolated* as they all share the same neutral.

Thus, as one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, if there is any current leakage from outlets 67, each of these leakages from the respective female outlet 67 would be added together back to the backbone cable 61. Hence, if cable 61 was connected to the main power supply, effectively the active, neutral and earth wiring presents just the single electrical isolated core. Ultimately all the leakages and the like occurring at the female outlets 67 are drawn through that single cable 61 and if such a cable 61 is connected to a circuit breaker (which it should be in a household building arrangement) the circuit would trip. It is clear that from a circuit perspective, outlets 67 are not electrically isolated.

Advantageously the backbone cable, an arrangement provided for in the claimed subject matter disclosed originally in relation to Figure 3 and now defined in the amended claims, unlike cable 61 presented in Figure 2 of the Hawker et al. '407 patent, includes at least three electrically isolated cores which wiring contained therein are adapted to be branched off into the respective female outlets. As the female branched outlets in the claimed subject matter are not all connected to the same active, neutral and earth wiring at the main supply, any leakages and the like occurring at the respective outlets are not added together.

As can be seen in the present claims, what is provided for is a wiring assembly for a building comprised of an electrical power supply backbone, a first end thereof being adapted to connect directly to an incoming mains power supply at a switchboard of the building, wherein the backbone comprises at least one substantially continuous length of cable of three electrically insulated electrically conducting cores, wherein the three separately insulated conducting cords include either active, neutral or earth wires, branched electrical outlets, where each branched outlet is electrically connected to a separate arrangement of active, neutral and earth wiring from the respective insulated sets of electrically conducting cores, such that an electrical socket connected to a first branched outlet, forms part of an electrically isolated circuit back to the main supply to that of another electrical socket connected to a second branched outlet with a different active, neutral and earth wiring arrangement.

Advantageously, as can be seen from independent claim 33, what is provided for and again supported in the detailed description in Figure 3 is that the insulating sets of conducting cores, are from a practical sense segregated active, neutral or earth wiring.

As one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, if one wished to branch off wiring from this main cable, all that one has to do is take a certain selected active, neutral and earth from each of the cores. This branched outlet then has separate circuitry back to the main supply, for example from another branched outlet, which takes a separate arrangement of the active, neutral and earth wiring from the three conducting cores.

Hence, ultimately, the electrical sockets that are connecting themselves to the branched outlets would be isolated from a socket which is electrically connected to another branched outlet from the main cable.

Applicant respectfully submits that the arrangement provided for in the presently claimed subject matter as defined clearly provides not only physical separation as in the Hawker et al. '407 patent, but most importantly electrical isolation, which is the whole reason why this particular claimed subject matter works well for the complete wiring installation of a building wherein for the most part the Hawker et al. '407 patent may provide only for physically separated outlets. The Hawker et al. '407 patent does not provide the means in which an electrician or the like can so easily, not only physically separate but also electrically separate the respective branched outlets.

Hence, there is *no* disclosure in the Hawker et al. '407 patent for a backbone comprising "at least one substantially continuous length of cable of three electrically insulated sets of electrically conducting cores, wherein three *separately insulated sets* of electrically conducting cores includes at least three active, neutral or earth wires, a plurality of branched electrical outlets, where *each branched outlet is electrically connected to a separate arrangement* of active, neutral and earth wiring from the respective electrically conducting cores, such that an electrical socket connected to a first branched outlet, forms part of *an electrically separated circuit* back to the main supply to that of another electrical socket connected to a second branched outlet," as in the amended independent claim 33.

Applicant respectfully submits that features of claim 33 discussed above are patentable over the Hawker et al. '407 patent. Therefore, as none of the cited prior art has disclosed the features of the claim, such a claim is novel and therefore patentable. Dependent claims 36 and 41-42 depend from (indirectly from or directly from) independent claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant submits that dependent claims 36 and 41-42 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 34 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hawker et al. '407 patent in view of the LeMaster '277 patent. Specifically, the Examiner concludes that the Hawker et al. '407 patent substantially discloses a wiring assembly as disclosed in the previous claim 33, wherein the sockets provide for insertion therein of a plug providing electrical connection for such plug with respective electrical conductors of the electrical power supply backbone, except for each of the plugs being electrically connected to an externally accessible fixed electrical socket in the building. As concluded by the Examiner, the Hawker et al. '407 patent does not disclose each of the plugs being electrically connected to an externally accessible fixed electrical socket in the building, as required by claim 34. The LeMaster '277 patent is presented as disclosing each of the plugs being electrically connected to an externally accessible fixed electrical socket in the building.

### **Response**

The rejection of claim 43 is moot as by this Response and Amendment, claim 43 is cancelled as discussed above.

This rejection is otherwise traversed as follows. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must establish: (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify the references exists; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art references teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicant's claim 34 sets forth:

"The wiring assembly of claim 33, wherein the sockets provide for insertion therein of a plug providing electrical connection for such plug with respective electrical conductors of the electrical power supply backbone, each of the plugs being electrically connected to an externally accessible fixed electrical socket in the building."

Newly amended claim 33 has been discussed above and includes:

"A wiring assembly for a building comprising an electrical power supply backbone, a first end thereof being adapted to connect directly to an incoming mains power supply at a switch board of the building, wherein the backbone comprises at least one substantially continuous length of cable of three electrically insulated sets of electrically conducting cores, wherein three separately insulated sets of electrically conducting cores includes at least three active, neutral or earth wires, a plurality of branched electrical outlets, where each branched outlet is electrically connected to a separate arrangement of active, neutral and earth wiring from the respective electrically conducting cores, such that an electrical socket connected to a first branched outlet, forms part of an electrically separated circuit back to the main supply to that of another electrical socket connected to a second branched outlet."

Firstly, Applicant respectfully submits that the arrangement provided for in the presently claimed subject matter as defined clearly provides not only physical separation as one can see in the Hawker et al. '407 patent and the LeMaster '277 patent, but most importantly electrical isolation, which is one of the reasons why this particular claimed subject matter works well for the complete wiring installation of a building wherein for the most part the Hawker et al. '407 patent may provide only for physically separated outlets. The Hawker et al. '407 patent and the LeMaster '277 patent do not provide the means in which an electrician or the like can so easily, not only physically separate but also electrically separate the respective branched outlets.

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter presented in claim 34 contradicts the prior art combination, and specifically contradicts a combination of the Hawker et al. '407 patent taken in view of the LeMaster '277 patent. In particular, this combination fails because the combination use would result in compact, managed combination housed arrays of power and communication (i.e. communication cable, data cable, LAN, voice/data/LAN bundles) connections. The LeMaster '277 patent also describes such housed arrays in contrast with a



typical work environment where “the disorder produced by the concomitant clutter of power cords, signal and data lines, etc. destroys all appearance of efficiency,” further underscoring the desire to provide devices configured in arrays. This is the opposite of Applicant’s claimed features in that Applicant’s connection is distributed through singular sockets for power only, effected by “the electronic component sliding from a proximal end to the distal end” of the terminal. Further, it is not clear from the Examiner cited figures 1 and 4 of the LeMaster ‘277 patent that each plug is “electrically connected to an *externally accessible* fixed electrical socket in the building” (emphasis added) as cited in the present claim 34.

It is at least for this reason that the combination of cited references fails. The claim as now presented does not include any type of housing for the “sockets [that] provide for insertion therein of a plug providing electrical connection for such plug with respective electrical conductors of the electrical power supply backbone, each of the plugs being electrically connected to an externally accessible fixed electrical socket in the building.” Accordingly, it is clear that the configuration of the electrical socket is neither shown nor suggested by the combination of the Hawker et al. ‘407 patent taken in view of the LeMaster ‘277 patent.

#### Rejection of claim 34

Applicant respectfully submits that the additional reference cited against claim 34, the LeMaster ‘277 patent, also fails to cure the deficiency of the Hawker et al. ‘407 patent. The arrangement provided for in the presently claimed subject matter as defined clearly provides electrical isolation. The Hawker et al. ‘407 patent and the LeMaster ‘277 patent do not provide the means in which an electrician or the like can so easily, not only physically separate but also electrically separate the respective branched outlets.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 34 and all the claims depending therefrom are unobvious over the cited references, whether taken alone or in any combination.

It is therefore respectively submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**THE NATH LAW GROUP**

August 20, 2008

THE NATH LAW GROUP  
112 South West Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891  
Tel: 703-548-6284  
Fax: 703-683-8396

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary M. Nath", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gary M. Nath  
Registration No. 26,965  
Jerald L. Meyer  
Registration No. 41,194  
Derek Richmond  
Registration No. 45,771  
Customer No. 20529